UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/986,733	11/09/2001	Narendran Ramakrishnan	01640279AA	5865

7590   08/03/2005

LAW OFFICES
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD, SUITE 340
P.O. Box 9204
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER
THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/986,733	Applicant(s) RAMAKRISHNAN, NARENDRAN
	Examiner Hanh B. Thai	Art Unit 2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*amendment filed April 25, 2005*</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　　2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>*3-12*</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>*3-12*</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

This is in response to amendment filed April 25, 2005.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3-12 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2.   Applicant argues regarding "partial evaluation step and simplification step...occur while

the computer program is running." In response, during the examination, examiner interprets the

claim as broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. Robinson discloses the

executing condition that satisfy specific requirement and variable condition to evaluate logical

analysis ("False or True") to produce a simplified program (Fig.19-20, Robinson) reads on

"partial evaluation of the computer program to produce a simplified program."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claim 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for

omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP

§ 2172.01. Applicant has omitted steps to ensure that the dialog between the user and the

information system is realized in the limitations of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 3-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fratkina et al. (US Pub. 2001/0049688 A1) in view of Robison (US 5,805,894).

Regarding claim 3, Fratkina discloses a systematic modeling methodology for information personalization in an information system which automatically adjusts information content, structure, and presentation to an individual user comprising the steps of:

-       modeling information-seeking interaction sequences with the information system wherein each interaction sequence denotes a possible dialog between the user and the information system, wherein a dialog in the step of modeling is a task-oriented information-seeking activity involving a list of information-seeking aspects comprising structural aspects specified by the user and terminal aspects as responses by the information system to the specified structural aspects (abstract; Fig.10-12 of Fratkina showing information-seeking interaction sequences system including the dialog between the user and the information system);

-       programmatically representing the interaction sequences in a computer program wherein the interaction sequences can be initiated by the user out-of-run (abstract; summary and Fig.10-12. Fratkina teaching the interaction between a human and a computer program);

-       creating a personalization system by partial evaluation ([0200]-[0209], Fratkina); and

- generating a personalized information space for the user in a user interface from the simplified program ([0097], Fratkina), wherein the generating step includes the step of: defining a program variable for each structure aspect, called structure variables (summary; Fig.10-12 and [0327], Fratkina); defining a program variable for each terminal aspect, called terminal variables ([0355]; [0149]-[0159], Fratkina); organizing the set of interaction sequences in terms of conditional elements on structural variables, using constructs provided in a programming language; declaring all structural variables to be parameters in the program; and if an interaction sequence produces values for terminal aspects, assigning values for respective terminal variables in corresponding programmatic representation (summary; Fig.10-12; [0093]-[0097], Fratkina).

Fratkina, however, does not disclose the partial valuation of the computer program to produce a simplified program. Robinson discloses the executing condition that satisfy specific requirement and variable condition to evaluate logical analysis ("False or True") to produce a simplified program (Fig.19-20, Robinson). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Fratkina to include the claimed feature as taught by Robison. The motivation of doing so would have been to efficiently provide a simpler task for the end user ([0097], Fratkina).

Regarding claim 4, Fratkina/Robison combination further discloses the step of compacting interaction sequences to determine a new set of interaction sequences having fewer states prior to the step of programmatically representing the interaction sequences in a computer program (Fig.10-12, Fratkina).

Regarding claim 5, Fratkina/Robison combination further discloses the step of creating a personalization system by partial evaluation of the computer program uses a source-to-source transformation engine that simplifies the computer program for static values of some program variables (col.9, lines 19-61, Robinson).

Regarding claim 6, Fratkina/Robison combination further discloses the step of generating a personalized information space for the user in a user interface is performed by mapping from the simplified program to the information space, in terms of a technology corresponding to the information system (Fig.10-12, Fratkina).

Regarding claim 11, Fratkina/Robison combination further discloses the step of partially evaluating the program with respect to values for structural program variables ([0200]-[0209], Fratkina).

Regarding claim 12, Fratkina/Robison combination further discloses the step of representing the information-seeking aspects as values for structural program variables; performing a partial evaluation with respect to the structural program variables (summary and Fig.10-12, Fratkina).

Regarding claim 7, Fratkina/Robison combination that the information-seeking interaction of the user is by means of a browser ([0014], Fratkina).

Regarding claim 8, Fratkina/Robison combination further discloses that the user interface is a browser window displaying an information space and a partial input specification window for facilitating user interaction ([0014], Fratkina).

Regarding claim 9, Fratkina/Robison combination further discloses that the browser

supports a browsing hierarchy, said step of modeling being performed using a nested

programmatic model (abstract and summary, Fratkina).

Regarding claim 10, Fratkina/Robison combination further discloses that the user

interface comprises two windows, a first window allowing the user to proceed with an

interaction along lines initiated by the information system and a second window allowing the

user to take an initiative and personalize the interaction by specifying some aspect out-of-turn

([0091]-[0097], Fratkina).

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

1. Bowman-Amuah (US 6,529,948 B1) disclose multi-object fetch component.

2. Quatrani, "visual modeling with rational ROSE and UML", April 1998, Addison-

Wesley, 3rd edition, Pages 3-12.

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hanh B. Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-4029. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh B Thai
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

July 29, 2005

UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER